UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/567,072	02/03/2006	Cheol-Min Kim	50413/011001	2285	
21559 CLARK & ELF	7590 03/06/200 BING LLP	8	EXAMINER		
101 FEDERAL	STREET		SHAW, AMANDA MARIE		
BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1634		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/06/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentadministrator@clarkelbing.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/567,072	KIM ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	AMANDA SHAW	1634				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	1. lely filed the mailing date of this co ○ (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the	merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-3,6-12,14 and 16-18</u> is/are pending	in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6-12,14 and 16-18</u> are subject to r	estriction and/or election require	ment.				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claim(s) 1-3, 6-12, and 16-18, drawn to probes and microarrays comprising probes for detecting drug resistance HBV.

Group 2, claim(s) 14, drawn to a method for using a microarray.

2. The inventions listed as Groups 1-2 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons:

A 371 case is considered to have unity of invention only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding technical features. The expression "special technical feature" means those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. In the instant application, the linking technical feature of a microarray for detecting drug resistant HBV mutations does not constitute a contribution over the prior art. For example, Vernet (Virus Research 2002) teaches that DNA chip technology can be used to detect resistance mutations in the

genome of HBV (page 69, col 2). Thus, there is no special technical feature linking the recited groups, as would be necessary to fulfill the requirement for unity of invention.

Page 3

3. In addition, the claims encompass multiple nucleic acids (SEQ ID NOs: 1-83). Polynucleotides are regarded as having the same or corresponding technical feature if the alternative have a common property or activity and share a significant structural element that is essential to the common property or activity. In the instant case the description fails to disclose that all of the nucleic acids share a common property or activity. Moreover, since the nucleic acid sequences are not homologous to one another, they fail to share a common structure. Since neither of these two requirements is met, the group of genes claimed does not meet the requirement of unity of invention.

Therefore Applicants are required to further elect:

For claim 6 Applicants must elect a single nucleic acid or single combination of nucleic acids selected from SEQ ID NOs: 7-47.

For claim 9 Applicants must elect a single nucleic acid or single combination of nucleic acids selected from SEQ ID NOs: 48-83.

For claim 16 Applicants must elect a single nucleic acid selected from SEQ ID NOs: 1-47.

For claim 17 Applicants must elect a single nucleic acid selected from SEQ ID NOs: 7-47.

For claim 18 Applicants must elect a single nucleic acid selected from SEQ ID NOs: 48-83

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.The

Application/Control Number: 10/567,072

Page 5

Art Unit: 1634

examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejections are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Application/Control Number: 10/567,072 Page 6

Art Unit: 1634

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda M. Shaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-8668. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 TO 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached at 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

Application/Control Number: 10/567,072 Page 7

Art Unit: 1634

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda M. Shaw Examiner Art Unit 1634

/Juliet C Switzer/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1634